



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK NOTICES

The Problem of the Fourth Gospel. By H. Latimer Jackson. Cambridge: University Press, 1918. Pp. xxiv+170. 6s.

An earlier volume by the same author entitled *The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent German Criticism* has been re-worked and brought up to date. In its present form it has an importance altogether out of proportion to its size. The author is familiar with that vast body of literature which has gathered about the Fourth Gospel, and he proves to be a skilful guide in leading his readers through the mazes of conflicting opinions. Nor is he content merely to summarize current opinions; he is himself a stimulating interpreter of the problems involved. To state his conclusions on some of the more important issues, a fresh study of the evidence regarding the date of the Gospel leads to the conviction that it arose at some time during the years 100-125 A.D. Neither the internal nor the external evidence is thought to furnish any substantial support for the traditional belief that the writer was the apostle John. Not a little weight is attached to the contrary tradition that John had suffered a martyr's death, probably by the year 70 A.D. The Gospel is thought to have been composed by an unknown Christian of Jewish ancestry but well acquainted with Hellenistic culture. He was a resident of Ephesus where he had long been engaged upon "the preliminaries of collecting and sorting materials which point not only to a variety of written and oral sources, but to the product of his own mind and soul." His work, however, was not given to the world until after his death, and then not until it had been worked over by editorial hands.

On the question of the relation of the Fourth Gospel to Hellenistic mysticism our author is strangely silent. One wonders whether he refuses to recognize this phase of Fourth Gospel study as of sufficient importance to be treated as a real "problem." It is also a pity that an index was not supplied, or at least a list of authorities cited, since the book is so valuable an epitome of current opinions. The analytical synopsis of contents goes only a very short way toward meeting this need.

The Transformation of Early Christianity from an Eschatological to a Socialized Movement.

By Lyford Patterson Edwards. Menasha, Wis.: Banta, 1919. Pp. 94.

The writer has approached an important phase of early Christianity from a new point of view. It is a well-known fact that the first Christians held themselves rigidly aloof from

their contemporary world, whose early destruction by the catastrophic intervention of God they expectantly awaited. It is also a well-known fact that by the middle of the fourth century the Christian attitude toward the contemporary social order had so completely changed that not only had belief in an early end of the world been very generally abandoned but Christians had become so aggressive in affairs of state that the new religion had been adopted by the emperors. The present monograph aims to interpret this remarkable transition by viewing it from the side of political and social interests. This emphasis is seen even in the chapter headings: Political Theories of the Early Christians, The Early Church and Property Concepts, The Early Church and the Populace, Chiliasm and Patriotism, and Chiliasm and Social Theory. The discussion throughout is fresh and suggestive, and is a distinct contribution to the matter in hand.

The Sources of the Hexateuch. By Edgar Sheffield Brightman. New York: Abingdon Press, 1918. Pp. 395. \$3.00.

The purpose of this excellent book is to provide the student with a much-needed tool. It presents us with the three great documents of the Hexateuch, J, E, and P, each by itself, so that the reader can get a definite impression of the separate documents. Each document is divided topically into paragraphs, and cross-references enable one to compare the parallel accounts. A series of footnotes, reduced to the smallest compass, apprise the student of the difference in critical opinion upon disputed or difficult passages. Into these seemingly insignificant but really most valuable notes an immense amount of labor has gone. The opinions of all the leading critical scholars including Erdmann are cited in them. A brief introduction is provided for each document giving the critical view as to its date, authorship, and main literary, religious, and ethical characteristics. Small type shows the more important glosses and redactional material. The plan of the book is simple, and Dr. Brightman has managed in a really remarkable way to set forth the results of one of the most highly technical and complicated of all literary problems in a clear and untechnical way, at the same time without the sacrifice of thoroughness and accuracy. It is scholarly and yet practical handbooks such as this that we are still sadly in need of.

In the case of P no attempt is made to distinguish Pg, Ps, and Rp. The reason given is because of the differences among critics and